DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 198 SP 006 991

AUTHOR	Arneklev, Bruce L.; Pugmire, Dorothy Jean
TITLE	A Program to Assist Educational Personnel to Teach Students of Wide Variability in Regular Classrooms. Director's Final Report. (July 1, 1970 to July 30, 1973).
INSTITUTION	Utah State Univ., Logan. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
GRANT	OEG-0-70-1896(725)
NOTE	57p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement; Educational Change; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Handicapped Children; Human Relations; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Retraining; Special Education; Team Teaching

ABSTRACT

The five goals of the 3-year Education Profession Development Act (EPDA) Project covered in this report are: a) to retrain experienced teachers and train auxiliary educational aides to assist handicapped children and educationally impoverished children to reach a higher level of learning potential in the regular classroom; b) to use the team approach as a positive force for the development of skills and understanding of human relationships requisite to effective participation in a team enterprise, with division of labor and limits of autonomy identified for each participating member; c) to effect change in the teacher education program by providing multiple opportunities for early entry, as well as conventional entry, into programs for growth in knowledge, awareness, and sensitivity to the handicapping conditions to learning; d) to involve agencies from the community in the educative process for the enhancement of learning for all children and for facilitation of constructive interaction between schools and communities; and e) to develop and test for dissemination techniques and materials that have been found useful in dealing with children with wide ranges of ability in the regular classroom. The document describes the operation of the program and includes two extensive appendixes ("Self-Concept Assessment Among Children" and "Performance Objectives and Related Data." (JA)

ED 083198

Director's Final Report

for

A PROGRAM TO ASSIST EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL TO TEACH STUDENTS OF WIDE VARIABILITY IN REGULAR CLASSROOMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1973

by

Bruce L. Arneklev: Research Coordinator

in Consultation with

Dorothy Jean Pugmire: Project Director

at

Edith Bowen Teacher Education Laboratory School

Department of Elementary Education

Utah State University

Logan, Utah

1973

SP 006 991

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to Grant #OEG-0-70-1896 (725) from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A List of Tables		vi
INTRODUCTION (Goals and related needs)		1
OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM		4
A.	Planning and Operation	4
B.	Participants	6
C.	Dissemination	6
D.	Evaluation	7
APPENDIXES		12
A.	Self-Concept Assessment Among Children	12
B.	Performance Objectives and Related Data	22
C.	The Training Model	32
D.	The Exceptional Child - Is he better off integrated into the regular classroom or segregated?	36
E.	Names and Roles of Associate Teachers 1972-1973	38
F.	Names and Roles of Staff and Consultants 1972-1973	39
G.	Names of Junior Block Students 1972-1973	43
H.	Seminar Topics	45
I.	Instructional Materials	48
J.	Letter from the USU Department of Special Education (Phyllis Publicover)	51
K.	Letter from Logan City Junior High School (Sherman Hansen)	55

A List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
I.	Correlations Between Scores Derived Concurrently from the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) and the FitzGibbon Rating Scale (FRS) for Measuring Childrens' Self-Concepts . . .	13
II.	Correlations Between Scores Derived Concurrently from the SEI and FRS for Measuring Childrens' Self-Concepts by Grade Level	13
III.	Correlations Indicative of FRS Interrater Reliability	14
IV.	Correlations Indicative of FRS Interrater Reliability at Different Grade Levels	15
V.	Correlations Indicative of Test-Retest Reliability	16
VI.	Reliability of the FRS and SEI through Two Test Cycles	17
VII.	Correlations Indicative of Test-Retest Reliability at Different Grade Levels	17
VIII.	Significance of the Difference Between Scores Attained by Special Education Students and More Typical Students on the FRS and SEI	18
IX.	Correlations Between Scores Derived Concurrently from the SEI and FRS With and Without Special Education Students in the Population	19
X.	FRS Distributions	20
XI.	SEI (Self-Concept) Distributions	20
XII.	SEI (Defensiveness) Distributions	21
XIII.	Significance of Changes in Affective (A) and Cognitive (C) Aspects of Trainee Attitudes Toward Themes Emphasized in the Project	23
XIV.	Self-Concept and Self-Criticism Scores from Trainees	25
XV.	Adjusted Self-Concept and Self-Criticism Scores from Trainees	26

A List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
XVI.	MTAI Scores from Trainees	27
XVII.	Individualization as Indicated by Behavior Checklist Scores	28
XVIII.	Special Education Knowledge Gained by Participants	30
XIX.	Employment Rates and Training Utilization	31

INTRODUCTION

The writing of the original proposal and negotiation for the three-year Education Profession Development Act (EPDA) project covered by this report occurred under the direction of Kenneth C. Farrer of USU and Edward R. Moore of USOE during the summer and fall of 1969. Goals and performance objectives listed in that proposal remained in the plans of operation for the duration of the project. Three primary goals were listed in the original proposal, and one additional goal was added in each plan of operation submitted annually thereafter. Those goals and related educational needs are listed below:

GOAL 1: To retrain experienced teachers and train auxiliary educational aides to assist handicapped children and educationally impoverished children to reach a higher level of learning potential in the regular classroom

NEED: Better preparation of teachers to meet the individual needs of children has always been a laudable goal. However, traditionally teachers have been best prepared to teach the hypothetically average child. This prompted the development of an array of supportive and often separate services to meet the needs of special children. These children became known for their differences and weaknesses, rather than the things which they had in common with other children and their potential. Now for better socialization of all children, and other reasons, it is being recognized that the needs of children should be met as much as possible within the regular classrooms by the regular teacher. For this especially demanding task, teachers need additional training and the support of other personnel. Educational aides can be of great assistance to the teacher in fulfilling that role, particularly when they are trained concurrently with the teacher.

GOAL 2: To use the team approach as a positive force for the development of skills and understandings of human relationships requisite to effective participation in a team enterprise with division of labor and limits of autonomy identified for each participating member.

NEED: Teachers have traditionally been trained to function singly without considering the skills requisite for working in teams. In order to use aides effectively, and to draw on other resources desirable for promoting learning (especially for teaching handicapped children), teachers must be assisted in the development of skills required for team work. Likewise, aides must acquire the skill of playing different roles within the team. Opportunities for team interaction and training for both teachers and aides currently occur primarily on the job where possibilities of consultation and flexibility are very limited.

GOAL 3: To affect change in the teacher-education program by providing multiple opportunities for early entry as well as conventional entry to training experiences in pre-kindergarten through sixth grade programs to know, to be aware, and to become more sensitive to the handicapping conditions to learning.

NEED: The acceptance of the needs listed above indicates a need for the revision of traditional teacher education programs. The potential of various methods of observation, study, and practicum participation in classrooms to provide realism and relevance in learning is a resource which is largely untapped and should be more fully investigated for use in preparation of people seeking positions in educational professions. If EPDA projects are to have a significant impact, the results of these endeavors must become an integral part of educational institutions. Only in this way can any long range effectiveness in meeting the needs listed above be obtained.

GOAL 4: To involve agencies from the community in the educative process for the enhancement of learning for all children, and for facilitation of constructive interaction between schools and communities.

NEED: Data from studies such as the Coleman report have indicated that factors other than those found in schools are of critical importance in promoting learning by children. Yet, school personnel are usually uncomfortable working with parents and agencies outside of the school. Therefore, efforts are necessary to prepare teachers and other school personnel to work with such agencies, and to help them be more compatible with and supportive

of school programs, so that children may experience a total environment which is conducive to desired learning.

GOAL 5: To develop and test for dissemination techniques and materials which have been found useful in dealing with children with wide ranges of ability in the regular classroom.

NEED: The likelihood of adequately meeting the needs of children having wide variations in abilities is greater if teachers are competent and have appropriate materials to work with. However, if acquisition of those competencies and materials can be gained only by direct contact with developers, the possibility for wide dissemination of project outcomes is severely limited. Also, the development process serves to refine and validate the utility of various ideas by exposing them to scrutiny from a variety of audiences.

OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

A one-year EPDA grant[1] to USU preceded the three-year grant covered by this report. The model for teacher and aide training which was initiated at the Teaching Education Laboratory School during that first year was maintained with some variations throughout the three-year extension. However, emphasis in the project expanded from training to include concern for institutional change, community involvement, and instructional materials development respectively during the first, second, and third years of the extension. Consequently, the discussion which follows will be directed to each of these areas of concern.

A. Planning and Operation

Historically, the Laboratory School staff had been concerned with meeting the needs of children and the needs of students in the University's teacher education program. Concern for meeting the needs of children was accentuated during the year prior to this grant when the special education classes for emotionally disturbed children were dissolved and those youngsters were integrated into regular classrooms. Until teachers became relatively comfortable with "wide variability"[2] in their classrooms, training other adults had to take second priority, and the concept of institutionalization which had been amplified during negotiation for funding was seldom considered by other than administrative personnel on the project staff.

During the second year of the grant the concept of institutionalization was expanded in accordance with O.E. directives from concern for impact on the teacher education program (which is discussed in part D below under evaluation) to include impact on the total university, other universities, public school programs, community agencies, state departments of education, other federal agencies, businesses, and industries. However, because sufficient resources (human and financial) were not available for a concerted program directed at all of these areas, community involvement in the schools, particularly in regard to parents, was selected as the focal point. Progress in other areas (such as the input made by the project director on an ethnic studies program in Ogden, Utah) was largely a function of taking advantage of unforeseen opportunities.

---

[1]Director's final report for "A cooperative instructional services program for improving educational personnel to teach special education students in the regular classroom." 1969-1970, Utah State University. Logan, Utah. 93 pp. (ERIC designation = ED 043 598).

[2]The concept "wide variability" was chosen rather than "handicapped," "exceptional," or "special education" because it encompassed concern for all children where special education children were integrated.

Officially, the production of instructional materials was not introduced into plans of operation until the final year of the program. However, much of the groundwork for that production was laid during the first and second year of this grant. An intensive two-week workshop during the summer prior to the final year was used to consolidate ideas and initiate the production of materials which were evaluated and revised during the final year. (More on this in part C below.)

A review of the data, which are summarized in part D below, indicated that a majority of the training objectives which were specified at the outset of the program were achieved. However, scrutiny of data obtained during the final year also indicates that desired types of impact on children and on stipend recipients tended to decrease as staff became 1) more supportive of the SODIA[3] program as a part of project institutionalization, and 2) more involved in materials development. Progress made in the latter two areas appears to be significant, but its ultimate practical importance will be very much a function of the post-project dedication of participants to the goals that were established by the project.

---

[3]SODIA is an acronym used to designate the new elementary teacher education program at USU. The letters stand for five major points of emphasis:

S̲elf = Helping the individual understand himself in relation to his ability and desire to teach.

O̲thers = Helping the individual to understand variability among children, and to assist him in objectively assessing how children react and relate to various educational stimuli.

D̲isciplines = Content areas (reading, language, art, social studies, math, and science) and how to assist children to assimilate them through the use of: a) methods and materials, b) small group introduction, c) strategies and skills in diagnosis, prescription and evaluation, d) individual instruction, and e) learning packages.

I̲mplementation = Student teaching

A̲ssociates = Credit by special arrangement after student teaching to: a) work in special school situations, b) pursuit of special interests, c) strengthen areas of weakness, and d) extend areas of competence.

B. Participants

During the first two years of this grant, trainees (teachers and aides) were selected by administrators in the school districts where they were to be employed. Criteria (including 1) that preference was to be given to members of educational disadvantaged groups and 2) that administrators could and would employ the trainees they sent) were given to administrators to insure the selection of the desired types of trainees. Satisfactory results were attained from this procedure. First, the percentage of minority group members among trainees was higher than that in any of the school populations in the districts served by the project. Second, post project employment rates among teachers reached the ninety percent criterion established in objectives and approached that level among aides.

Certified teachers were employed at the training site as associate teachers during the final year of the project. This was done because of limited funds, the availability of unemployed teachers, and a desire to give support to Laboratory School teachers who were working on instructional materials and supervising university students as an integral part of the SODIA model. However, the lower salaries available because of this rationale made it impossible to attract minority group members who also were sought by programs which could offer higher salaries.

C. Dissemination

Three primary means of disseminating the ideas and materials developed through the project have been used to date. The first of these is the ERIC system for storage and retrieval of annual reports. The second has been at conferences, sponsored in part by the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES) or by professional associations. The third has been through USU workshops which featured the materials developed through the project. Each of these means has particular advantages and disadvantages.

The ERIC system undoubtedly gains exposure to the broadest possible audience, and is economical and readily available to potential users. It also provides a convenient source to which project staff can make references in response to inquiries about project activity. However, no evidence is available to indicate if the ERIC retrieval system has been used and/or is useful for potential readers of reports indexed from this project.

Conferences sponsored by NCIES have brought together many producers of instructional products and potential users. This process has been expedient, but appears to be relatively expensive and dependent on a complex coordination process provided by sponsoring agencies. On the other hand, conferences sponsored by professional associations tend to cater to a broader audience which avails itself of established channels for communication about recent developments. For example, requests for materials were twice as great after one presentation at the Annual American Educational Research Association (AERA) meeting than after all three NCIES

sponsored conferences. The greater number (qualitative factors not withstanding) of requests resulting from the AERA meeting is probably due to the wider circulation of the conference programs and abstracts.

Workshops generated by the project undoubtedly served the smallest and most select audiences. However, they usually offered the greatest possibility for dialogue and follow-up for potential users. The workshops offered by the USU Project also aided in the development process and provided exposure to an audience which is likely to be further involved with the ideas which the project staff advocated.

D. Evaluation

Data were gathered on three reference groups (children, adults in training, and institutions responsible for education) during the operation of the program. Data relative to each of the first two years of the grant have been published in Appendix A of previous annual reports.[4 and 5] From that data and additional data from the final year, the following observations may be made about impact.

1. On Children:

When the academic progress of special education and more typical children at the Laboratory School was measured annually by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, achievement was equal or enhanced on successive years in spite of the distractions imposed by a fluctuating training program. However, the shortcomings[6 and 7] inherent in attempt to infer levels of achievement on the basis of standardized tests became increasingly apparent with careful study. Undergoing the testing process also generally proved to be a negative experience for special children. Therefore, standardized achievement testing was discontinued in favor of using anecdotal evidence and parental responses as a more constructive means of assessment for curriculum development and evaluation.

When the self-concepts of special education and more typical children were measured at the begin-

---

[4]Director's annual progress report "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classrooms." 1970-1971. Utah State University, Logan, Utah. (111 pages) ERIC designation - ED 054 069.

[5]Director's annual progress report for "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classrooms." 1971-1972. Utah State University, Logan, Utah (108 pages) ERIC designation = ED 068 443.

[6]Ibid., pp. 24 & 30

[7]Mecklenburg, James. Performance Contracting. (NSSE Series on contemporary issues) Charles A. Jones Pub. Co, Worthington, Ohio. 1972. pp. 39-41 and 64-66.

ning and end of each year by the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) and the FitzGibbon Rating Scale (FRS), scores indicated that self-concepts were maintained or enhanced in the context where training occurred. The project data from the SEI and FRS provided the first substantial evidence of concurrent validity to be published on self-concept measures. The attainment of indications of concurrent validity was attributed to moderately high inter-rater and test-retest reliability, which were in turn a function of heterogeneity in the population studied. Indications of validity were greatest in intermediate grades (4-6), and less substantial in primary grades (K-3) and junior high grades (7-8).

2. On Trainees:

a. Semantic differential scores indicative of enthusiasm for the major themes emphasized during the training period were high. A statistically significant increase in enthusiasm was measured toward "educating exceptional children in regular classrooms."

b. Tennessee Self Concept scores fluctuated greatly and were subject to confounding factors. However, when "openness to self-criticism" was statistically controlled, the trainees as a group attained significant gains.

c. Attitude assessment with the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (a measure of attitudes empirically determined to be conducive to "harmonious relations" in the classroom) revealed statistically significant gains among trainees.

d. Behavior checklists used to assess student centeredness, as a measure of individualization, indicated progress by all groups while they were in training, and follow-up in districts where trainees were employed indicated that a decline below the eighty percent criterion (that had been established in the objectives) had not occurred.

e. As a total group trainees made statistically significant gains on a test of special education knowledge.

Questionnaires returned by past participants indicated that employment rates among teachers and aides were ninety and eighty-one percent respectively. The extent to which trainees, especially aides, were able to use their preparation was largely a function of the strength of commitment of the administrators who sent the trainees to hire them after the completion of training.

Comparisons of attainment by different groups indicated that a combination of seminar and practicum was necessary to promote the desired attitude and self-concept changes. Neither practicum nor seminar in and of itself was effective in bringing about the desired attitude change.

3. On Institutions:

Five major "projected changes in teacher education, 1970-73"[8] were indicated during negotiations in justification of funding for this three-year program. They were respectively (with current status of attainment):

a. The new design of a foundations course for prospective teachers to include exposure to concepts advanced by the project. (The project director is now primarily responsible for this course which is the foundation for the "self" development portion of the SODIA model.)

b. To "provide opportunity for 1) observation, 2) study, and 3) limited participation in local school classrooms..." by students in lower division classes. (This is now accomplished by the sophomore bloc portion of SODIA.)

c. To "facilitate the identification of children with handicapping conditions to learning at an earlier age." (This is accomplished in part by involvement of students from university kindergarten classes at the laboratory school where handicapped children are integrated; however, accomplishment is limited by the lack of a unit containing four-year-olds who have handicaps.)

d. To combine the "... existing isolated and autonomous methods classes ... into a quarter's inter-related workshop ..." (This is now accomplished through the junior bloc section of SODIA.)

e. That "... instruction in special education ... will become an integral part of the elementary education credential program for all students." (This is now accomplished by exposure to special education students in the regular classrooms at the laboratory school and instruction from knowledgeable persons in the sophomore bloc portion of SODIA.)

Indications of institutionalization beyond the university teacher education program are reflected largely through the continuation of activities that were initiated by people who have been connected with the project. Some of these were: 1) the establishment of parent groups in the public schools under the sponsorship of the school and the mental health association, 2) the implementation of workshops using instructional materials developed through the project, 3) meeting the needs of special education children in regular classrooms at selected schools in the state, and 4) staff and trainees from

---

[8] Plan of Operation to the U.S. Office of Education Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. O.E. Log No. Utah 2043 for "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classrooms." 1970-1971, pp. 2-4.

the project serving as leaders in education at local and state levels.

APPENDIX A

Self-Concept Assessment Among Children

A substantial amount of time and energy were given during this project to the investigation of the utility of various psychometric instruments for the assessment of the impact of the project on children and adults. A major part of that investigation is reported in the 1972 annual report.[1] This appendix will be used to extend and elaborate on the self-concept findings reported in the 1972 report.

1. Validity

Indications of content or face validity are frequently used to substantiate that particular self-concept measures do in fact measure the construct of "self-concept." However, scores obtained from different types of self-concept measures seldom do correlate to a statistically significant extent. This raises questions about the nature of self-concept and why different types of self-concept instruments apparently measure different things.

The 1972 annual report was used to explore these questions and to announce evidence of concurrent validity between self-report and teacher rating methods used to achieve scores for the inference of self-concept."[2] The Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory[3] (SEI) and FitzGibbon Rating Scale[4] (FRS) were the two tools used for assessment by self-report and teacher rating respectively. During the 1972-1973 academic year, a replication and extension of that study was undertaken. The following table reports comparative findings of concurrent validity from the two studies.

From Table I it may be seen that comparable statistically significant correlations were obtained between the SEI and FRS during two consecutive academic years. During the 1972-1973 year, the study was extended to the seventh and eighth grade level, and the following results were obtained.

---

[1] Director's annual progress report for "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classroom." 1971-1972, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. 108 p. (ERIC designation = ED 068 443).

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

[3] Coopersmith, Stanley. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. W. H. Freeman Company. San Francisco, 1967. pp. 265-266.

[4] Director's annual progress report ... 1971-1972. pp. 85-86.

TABLE I

Correlations Between Scores Derived Concurrently from the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) and the FitzGibbon Rating Scale (FRS) for Measuring Childrens' Self Concepts (Grades 4, 5, and 6)

Occasion	1971-1972 (N=80)	1972-1973 (N-82)
Pretest	.46**	.43**
Posttest	.45**	.39**

**p < .01 (These correlations would have occurred by chance less than one time in one hundred)

TABLE II

Correlations Between Scores Derived Concurrently from the SEI and FRS for Measuring Childrens' Self-Concepts by Grade Level

Grade	Pretest	Posttest
4 (N = 26)	.46*	28
5 (N = 31)	.42*	.51*
6 (N = 25)	.27	.49*
7 (N = 80)	.08	.28*
8 (N = 76)	.15	.33*

*p < .05

From Table II it may be seen that the magnitude of correlations between the SEI and FRS tended to decline with grade level, particularly after the sixth grade when familiarity with individual students is reduced by the increased number of students of which the teacher must be aware in a junior high school setting. Credence is given to this (familiarity) explanation by the fact that concurrence had increased significantly in the 7th and 8th grade at the time of the posttest.

The 1971-72 report indicated that inter-rater reliability, test retest reliability, and heterogeneity in the targer population were of primary importance in the attainment of indications of concurrent validity. The relative function of these three factors in the replication will now be considered in turn, along with elaboration in the context of the extension into upper and lower grades.

2. Inter-rater Reliability

The extent to which a test measures the same quantity (i.e., is consistent) for two raters is frequently used as an indicator of reliability. The two individuals in this case were the associate teacher and master teacher in each classroom. They independently rated each child for the pretest and posttest on the FRS. Table III shows correlations indicative of inter-rater reliability for the original study and again for the replication.

From Table II it may be seen that comparable levels of inter-rater reliability were obtained on replication. It is also of note that correlations obtained on the replication were slightly lower and may have contributed to slightly lower indications of concurrent validity which were reported in Table I above.

Note was also made above of the importance of familiarity in attaining concurrent validity; however, the data reported in Table IV indicate that other factors apparently confound this simple explanation at the lower grade levels.

From Table IV it may be seen that inter-rater reliability dropped off sharply on the posttest in grades one

TABLE III
Correlations Indicative of FRS Inter-rater Reliability
(Grades 4, 5, and 6)

Occasion	1971-1972 (N=80)	1972-1973 (N=82)
Pretest	.85**	.80**
Posttest	.77**	.73**

**$p < .01$

TABLE IV
Correlations Indicative of FRS Inter-rater Reliability
at Different Grade Levels

Grade	Pretest	Posttest
K (N = 25)	.40*	.68**
1 (N = 33)	.85**	.55**
2 (N = 33)	.86**	.36
3 (N = 22)	.80**	.30
4 (N = 26)	.89**	.81**
5 (N = 31)	.81**	.79**
6 (N = 25)	.78**	.74**
7 (N = 80)	.38**	.46**
8 (N = 76)	.39**	.64**

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
Note: The lower correlations on the pretest in grades K, 7, and 8 may be due to restricted range (see Table X in this appendix).

through three in spite of an opportunity during the academic year for the two raters to obtain greater familiarity with the students subject to their instruction. This drop also occurred in grades four through six, but not nearly so markedly. This is in contrast to the rather marked improvement which occurred in grades seven and eight.

One can only speculate that children in the primary grades may represent different things to different people and thus contribute to different judgments, while the greater academic orientation during the intermediate grades promotes uniformity in perception. Whatever the cause, the attainment of less acceptable levels of inter-rater reliability in the primary grades is of particular significance when assessment of self-concept progress is attempted among younger children.

The relatively low level of inter-rater reliability in the primary grades and again at the seventh and eighth grade levels is also coincident with the magnitude of correlations indicative of concurrent validity at those grade levels.

3. Test-Retest Reliability

The extent to which a test measures the same quantity (i.e., is consistent) for the same subjects at two different times is also frequently used, as an indicator of re-

liability. The seven-month period between pretest and posttest in this study is somewhat long for demonstrating test-retest reliability, but it does provide an index by which to evaluate the stability of what is purportedly measured by the FRS and SEI. Table V shows test-retest reliability coefficients for the original study and again for the replication.

sixth graders who remained in the project through two complete testing cycles (pre and post tests in 1971-1972 and again for the pre and post tests in 1972-1973). Progression in consistency during testing is shown in Table VI.

From Table VI it may be seen that there was consistent progression

TABLE V
Correlations Indicative of Test-Retest Reliability
(Grades 4, 5, and 6)

Instrument	1971-1972 (N=80)	1972-1973 (N=82)
FRS	.68	.83
SEI (Self-Concept)	.75	.81
SEI (Defensiveness)	.40	.67

Note: Correlations on the Defensiveness scale are lower because of a small number of items (8) on that scale; however, all correlations are significant beyond the .01 level.

From Table V it may be seen that indications of test-retest reliability had improved to some extent on the replication. This may be partially a function of the time between test and retest (reduced from 8 months to 7 months), but is probably more a function of increased familiarity with the instruments by the teachers (on the FRS) and the children (on the SEI). This explanation is validated by a study of forty-one fourth, fifth and

in reliability on all measures when the same population was followed through four administrations of the same instruments. One could speculate that the increase in children's ages may contribute to this increase in stability. Data relative to that speculation are presented in Table VII.

From Table VII it may be seen that FRS test-retest reliability, like inter-rater reliability, is lower in

TABLE VI
Reliability of the FRS and SEI through Two Test Cycles**

	1971-1972 (N=41)		1972-1973 (N=41)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	Between	Between	Between	
FRS	.56	.74	.79	
SEI (Self-Concept)	.62	.74	.80	
SEI (Defensiveness)	.44	.52	.63	

**All correlations are significant beyond the .01 level

TABLE VII
Correlations Indicative of Test-Retest Reliability
at Different Grade Levels

Grade	FRS	SEI (Self-Concept)	SEI (Defensiveness)
K (N = 25)	.30 (ns)		
1 (N = 33)	.59		
2 (N = 23)	.16 (ns)		
3 (N = 22)	.67		
4 (N = 26)	.87	.77	.73
5 (N = 31)	.82	.77	.66
6 (N = 25)	.77	.94	.64
7 (N = 80)	.44	.79	.42
8 (N = 76)	.37	.54	.35

ns = not significantly different from zero (all other correlations are significant beyond the .01 level.

note: SEI scores are self-report scores and not available below grade four because of the need for a functional level of literacy on the part of children to respond to the inventory.

the primary grades and again at the junior high level. The reliability of self-report scores on the SEI scales also tends to decline at the seventh and eighth grade levels. This relative decline of reliability on all scales at the seventh and eighth grade level is coincident with the decline in concurrent validity depicted in Table II above, and should raise reservations as to the validity of self-concept measures at the junior high school level. Serious questions might also be raised about the validity of these measures at the primary grade level because of inconsistency in levels of reliability attained.

4. Heterogeneity Among Subjects

Much special education is initiated on the assumption that lower self-concepts are coincident with handicapping conditions. Inasmuch as over ten percent of the Laboratory student population had been classified as emotionally disturbed, self-concept data from grades four, five, and six were analyzed to see if the emotionally disturbed children did attain different scores than their more typical classmates. Comparative data related to that question for the 1971-1972 and 1972-1973 academic years are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
Significance of the Difference Between Scores Attained by Special Education Students and More Typical Students on the FRS and SEI

Instrument		Occasion	More Typical $\bar{x}$ Score	Special Ed. $\bar{x}$ Score	Average Difference	(F) Level of Significance
FRS	71-72	Pretest	64.4	42.0	22.4	20.86**
		Posttest	73.7	49.9	23.8	22.90**
	72-73	Pretest	70.3	37.8	32.0	66.68**
		Posttest	67.8	38.3	30.0	64.97**
SEI (Self-Concept)	71-72	Pretest	37.1	25.4	11.7	20.19**
		Posttest	39.7	26.6	13.1	30.54**
	72-73	Pretest	37.8	29.1	8.7	11.32**
		Posttest	37.2	28.7	8.5	8.29**

**$p < .01$

Note: the number of subjects was 71 for more typical and 9 for special ed. in 1971-1972, and 71 for more typical and 11 for special ed. in 1972-1973.

From Table VIII it may be seen that special education students scored significantly lower than more typical children on the FRS and SEI during two studies on consecutive years. The 1971-1972 annual report was used to indicate that heterogeneity in the population did contribute to the attainment of higher correlation coefficients. Coefficients relative to that consideration are depicted in Table IX.

From Table IX it may be seen that the removal of self-concept scores attained by special education students lowered the amount of common variance on the two measures by about ten percent. From these data it may be concluded that the presence of special education students in the population did contribute significantly to the attainment of indications of concurrent validity.

5. Normative Data

There is serious question as to the validity of normative data derived from self-concept scales, but the data gathered in this study may prove to be useful to other investigators and there is some room for speculation about the trends in the scores attained, therefore, further statistics are presented here.

From Table X it may be seen that the average self-concept levels as measured by behavior rating tended to increase through grade six. The drop in scores at grades seven and eight may be a result of identification with class progression up to the "top of the heap" in the elementary grades, and then becoming low status persons again at the beginning of the junior high school. Data to substantiate this hypothesis are shown in Table XI.

TABLE IX

Correlations Between Scores Derived Concurrently from the SEI and FRS With and Without Special Education Students in the Population (Grades 4, 5, and 6)

Population	Occasion	1971-1972	1972-1973
Including Special Ed.	Pretest	.46**	.43**
	Posttest	.45**	.39**
Excluding Special Ed.	Pretest	.35**	.24**
	Posttest	.34**	.26**
Only Special Ed.	Pretest	.13	.58
	Posttest	-.21	.09

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE X
FRS Distributions

Grade	Pretest Mean	Pretest Standard Deviation	Posttest Mean	Posttest Standard Deviation
K (N = 25)	56.3	8.7	59.4	10.6
1 (N = 33)	59.1	13.8	57.6	12.2
2 (N = 23)	58.7	11.5	59.0	13.7
3 (N = 22)	58.6	15.3	55.1	13.2
4 (N = 26)	60.7	19.8	62.3	18.4
5 (N = 31)	67.6	15.0	63.7	14.5
6 (N = 25)	69.3	13.2	65.6	12.3
7 (N = 80)	61.2	8.8	61.3	12.9
8 (N = 76)	59.9	8.5	61.2	11.1

TABLE XI
SEI (Self-Concept) Distributions

Grade	Pretest Mean	Pretest Standard Deviation	Posttest Mean	Posttest Standard Deviation
4 (N = 26)	33.3	7.3	29.3	8.6
5 (N = 31)	37.0	9.4	37.9	7.8
6 (N = 25)	39.8	6.8	40.8	7.8
7 (N = 80)	32.8	8.5	33.0	8.9
8 (N = 76)	33.1	7.9	35.5	7.6

From Tables X and XI it may be seen that through grade six there is a concurrent increase in scores from which to infer self-concept on two independent measures. At grade seven there is a concurrent drop in scores on the two measures, and Table XI provides evidence from which to speculate that the progression in scores may be starting again. The increase in SEI scores from the seventh to the eighth grade may be of special significance because it occurred in concert with lowering scores on a measure of defensiveness.

From Table XII it may be seen that level of defensiveness as measured by self-report items on the SEI decreased consistently with progression in grade level. Whether this decline is a result of increasing sophistication at test taking or a bona fide indication of decreasing defensiveness is subject to question, but it is of note in assessing the meaning of self-report items used to evaluate self-concept status.[5]

TABLE XII

SEI (Defensiveness) Distributions

	Pretest		Posttest	
Grade	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
4 (N = 26)	2.2	1.7	2.2	1.6
5 (N = 31)	2.4	1.8	1.8	1.8
6 (N = 25)	1.8	2.0	1.4	1.8
7 (N = 80)	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.2
8 (N = 76)	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3

[5] See Appendix B on self-concept assessment among adults for amplification about the confounding effects of openness to self-criticism (defensiveness) in the assessment of self-concept by self-report.

APPENDIX B

Performance Objectives and Related Data

Seven performance objectives were used throughout this three-year project to provide a framework for data collection and evaluation. As was noted in the introduction, a new goal was added during each progressive year of the project in keeping with BE-PD priorities; however, the initial thrust of the grant (training) remained as the primary area for preconceived objective evaluation. Progress toward each of the specified objectives during respective years is outlined in previous annual reports.[1 and 2] Data and narrative in this section will focus on the overall attainment of objectives with specific attention to variations during different academic years.

Each performance objective will be repeated here as it appeared in the original proposal, followed by relevant data and interpretation thereof. (Objectives one and two will be considered together inasmuch as data collected in reference to them were drawn from items on two independent values of the same instrument, and that the data from those scales are closely interrelated.)

OBJECTIVE

1. Trainees will develop increasingly positive values (the connotative, emotional and/or affective aspect of attitudes) toward working with exceptional children in the regular classroom, team teaching, teacher aides, parental involvement, and community control as measured quarterly by semantic differentials designed for the respective areas.

OBJECTIVE

2. Trainees will develop increasingly positive beliefs (the denotative rational and/or cognitive aspect of attitudes) about the reasonableness of educating exceptional children in the regular classroom, team teaching, teacher aides, parental involvement, and community control as measured quarterly by semantic differentials designed for the respective areas.

Data collected to indicate attainment of objectives one and two

---

[1] Director's annual progress report for "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classrooms." 1970-1971, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. 111 pages. (ERIC designation - ED 054 069.)

[2] Director's annual progress report for "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classrooms." 1971-1972, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. 108 pages. (ERIC designation - ED 068 443.)

were collected via semantic differential scales developed by the author.[3] The scales were designed to measure affective (A) and cognitive (C) aspects of attitudes towards the major themes emphasized in the project. Taken together, progression on the A and C scales can be interpreted as a measure of increased enthusiasm for each of the themes emphasized in the project. Data collected by way of the two scales are summarized in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

Significance of Changes in Affective (A) and Cognitive (C) Aspects of Trainee Attitudes Toward Themes Emphasized in the Project
(N = 74)

Themes	Aspects	Average Pretest Score	Average Posttest Score	Average Gain	(t) Level of Significance
Educating Exceptional Children in the regular classroom	A	35.2	37.5	2.4	2.17*
	C	36.5	37.7	1.2	1.15
Team Teaching	A	39.1	39.9	.8	1.06
	C	39.9	39.3	-.6	.74
Teacher Aides	A	41.2	40.9	-.3	.52
	C	40.0	39.8	-.2	.32
Community Control of Schools	A	26.3	29.3	2.7	1.90
	C	28.3	30.2	1.9	1.43
Parental Involvement in the classroom	A	36.9	37.8	.9	.91
	C	33.3	37.6	4.3	1.48

Note: A t of 2.00 is necessary for the achievement of significance at the .05 level.

[3] Ibid., pp. 49-51 (contains a copy and explanation of development).

From Table XIII it may be seen that enhancement of attitudes to a statistically significant extent was attained only on the affective aspects of attitudes toward "educating exceptional children in the regular classroom." Also that the changes tended to be small and in the positive direction on the aspects of attitude toward any one theme.

Recognition of the fact that 44 is the highest possible score and that 24 is indicative of a neutral (neither pro or con) attiiude is important in interpreting the scores attained. With that in mind, it can be seen that all participants arrived with relatively high enthusiasm for things to be emphasized in the project. Several participants scored at the test ceiling on the pretest. This precluded the possibility of their showing any gain between pretest and posttest, and reduced the likelihood that significant gains would be attained by the total group.

OBJECTIVE

3. The self concepts of trainees will become higher (p is less than .05) through the EPDA Project, as measured by pre and post-project tests with the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).

Elsewhere[4,5,6&7] note has been made of the importance of considering data in addition to self-report scores from self-concept scales when inferences about the status of self-concepts are to be made. In keeping with those recommendations data are reported in Table XIV on the "openness to self-criticism" scale, as well as the self-concept scale of the TSCS.

From Table XIV it may be seen that when self-concept and openness to self-criticism are considered independently, significant gains were not made by trainees.

Theoretically,[8] a case can be made for adjusting self-concept

---

[4]Director's final report for "A cooperative instructional services program for improving educational personnel to teach special education students in regular classrooms." 1969-1970, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. 93 p. (ERIC designation =ED 043 598.)

[5]Director's annual progress report .... 1970-1971, pp. 32-34.

[6]Director's annual progress report .... 1971-1972, pp. 33-35 & 52-53.

[7]Arneklev, Bruce L. 'Defensiveness as a covariate in the assessment of self-concept change," in Research in Education (ERIC) in press.

[8]Arneklev, B. L. "The use of defensiveness as a covariate of self-respect in the assessment of self-concept among Navajo adolescents." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1970.

TABLE XIV

Self-Concept and Self-Criticism Scores from Trainees

	Average Pretest Score	Average Posttest Score	Average Gain	(t) Level of Significance
Self-Concept (N = 74)	355.0	357.2	2.2	.73 ns
Openness to Self-Criticism (N = 74)	33.2	34.1	.9	1.63 ns

ns = not significantly different from zero.

Note: a t greater than 2.00 is necessary in order to achieve significance at the .05 level.

scores by the extent to which the subject becomes more (or less) open to self-criticism. When an individual responds to self-report items like those on the TSCS, his score is very much a function of the extent to which he "bares his soul." The more humble, or open he is to criticizing himself, the lower his score on self-report items is likely to be. Conversely, if he is arrogant and unwilling or unable to "level" about some of his shortcomings, his self-report score will be artificially inflated. Currently there are no self-report measures of self-concept which control for distortions caused by variations in this test taking set between the pre and post-test.

The TSCS provides scores derived from a separate group of items by which to monitor self-concept and openness to self-criticism, but a satisfactory systematic method of interrating scores from these scales has not been published. One proposal for such a process is spelled out in the following formula:

$$\left[\left(\frac{X_2i - X_1i}{\frac{X\sigma_1 + X\sigma_2}{2}}\right)\left(Y\sigma_2\right)\right] + Y_2i = \text{Adjusted self-concept score for each individual}$$

Where:

X_1i = Pretest scores for each individual on the openness to self-criticism scale.

X_2i = Posttest scores for each individual on the openness to self-criticism scale.

$X\sigma_1$ = Standard deviation of the pretest scores on the openness to self-criticism scale.

$X\sigma_2$ = Standard deviation of the posttest scores on the openness to self-criticism scale.

$Y\sigma_2$ = Standard deviation of the posttest scores on the self-concept scale.

Y_2i = Posttest score for each individual on the self-concept scale.

Application of the formula outlined above to the data derived with the TSCS would adjust the numbers in Table XIV to those which are listed in Table XV.

From Table XV it may be seen that the net effect of the adjustment process is to apply any change that occurred on the openness to self-criticism to the posttest scores on the self-concept scale. This reduces the change in openness to self-criticism to zero while adjusting self-concept scores inversely by the standard score equivalent of that amount. (It is important to use a standard score conversion process, because each unit of change on the openness to self-criticism scale approximates five units of change on the self-concept scale.) It is of note that gain in scores from which to infer levels of self-concept becomes statistically significant when the confounding effects of openness to self-criticism are controlled for by formula. If this process is accepted as legitimate, it may be concluded that objective 3 was achieved.

TABLE XV

Adjusted Self-Concept and Self-Criticism Scores from Trainees

	Average Pretest Score	Average Posttest Score	Average Gain	(t) Level of Significance
Self-Concept	355.0	362.9	7.9	2.12*
Openness to Self-Criticism	33.2	33.2	0	ns

*$p < .05$

OBJECTIVE

4. Trainees will develop increasingly positive values of the child's role in the process of learning, as measured quarterly by the Minnesota Attitude Inventory (MTAI).

Reasons for using the MTAI as an appropriate criterion for evaluating project effectiveness have been noted in a previous annual report.[9] Subsequent to that report, Blackwell[10] has noted that teachers of the trainable mentally retarded who scored high on the MTAI were independently judged to be more effective than those who scored low. Use of the MTAI in this way as a criterion measure appears to be on the upswing.

A summative MTAI picture of trainee characteristics and changes therein from the beginning to the end of the project involvement is provided by data in Table XVI.

From Table XVI it may be seen that both teachers and aides made progress on the MTAI which was highly significant. Each group of trainees achieved higher average scores on the posttest than on the pretest. It is also of note that certified teachers made significantly higher scores on the average than paraprofessional aides (t's of 5.03 and 3.79 respectively for the pretest and posttest difference between aide and teacher groups). From these data, it may be concluded that objective 4 was achieved, and that personnel who are academically sophisticated tend to achieve higher scores than paraprofessional aides.

OBJECTIVE

5. Trainees will demonstrate an increasing tendency to individualize their instruction as measured quarterly by a behavioral check list.

TABLE XVI
MTAI Scores from Trainees

	Average Pretest Score	Average Posttest Score	Average Gain	(t) Level of Significance
Aides (N = 31)	7.6	26.2	18.6	4.86**
Teachers (N = 43)	44.0	58.0	14.0	3.93**

**p < .01

[9] Director's annual progress report .... 1971-1972, pp. 54-55.

[10] Blackwell, Robert B. Study of effective and ineffective teachers of the trainable mentally retarded. Exceptional Children. Vol. 39, #2, Oct. 1972, pp. 139-143.

Data reported in previous annual reports[11 & 12] substantiated that levels of individualization did increase on a quarterly basis, and that levels reached in training did not decrease significantly when trainees returned to more naturalistic settings for employment.

A cumulative picture for the three-year project period is unavailable because the scoring format on the instrument was changed to achieve a broader distribution of scores (see footnotes 11 and 12, pages 81 and 57 respectively for a comparison of instrument formats). Table XVII shows summary data for the final year of this grant.

From Table XVII it may be seen that significant gains were not made by associate teachers at the Laboratory School, but were made at the Junior High School. However, a comparison of data between the two settings provides information for drawing conclusions which may be more important. Note that the average score in April at the Laboratory School was 72.63 while the average score at the Junior High School was 59.00. A t for the difference between these average scores is 4.23, significant beyond the .01 level. This indicates that trainees at the Laboratory School (elementary level) were rated to have provided a much more individualized type of training for the students in their practicum setting than their counterparts at the junior high level. Thus, significance of gain may not have been the most important criterion for evaluating the ef-

TABLE XVII
Individualization as Indicated by
Behavior Checklist Scores

	Rating	Average Score	Gain	(t) Level of Significance
Scores for Trainees at the Laboratory School (N = 8)	Oct.	70.75	.88	.58 ns
	Dec.	71.63	1.00	1.13 ns
	April	72.63		
Scores for Trainees at the Junior High (N = 6)	Oct.	not used		
	Dec.	50.17	8.83	5.13**
	April	59.00		

**$p < .01$

[11]Director's annual progress report .... 1970-1971, pp. 36-37 & 81.

[12]Director's annual progress report .... 1971-1972, pp. 35-37 & 56-57.

fectiveness of the program. This is especially so when one recognizes that the ceiling on the instrument (85) precluded the possibility of some trainees at the Laboratory School to attaining an increase in score.

Recognition that a trainee's rating is very much a function of the nature of his or her practicum setting is also important in interpreting progress toward individualization. A first consideration is that the Junior High trainees had daily contact with over two hundred students while in the Laboratory setting they worked with less than thirty. Numbers of students alone mediated against junior high level trainees achieving high scores on items such as "The setting of goals and evaluation in terms of those goals was accomplished with student participation." A second consideration is that the "master teachers" at the Junior High School were in their first year with the project and had little or no experience working with other people in their rooms, or with ways of individualizing as emphasized by the project. The importance of this second consideration is high-lighted by the fact, as is apparent in Table XVII, that the rating checklists were not used in October at the Junior High School because the evaluator thought that master teachers there were not sufficiently prepared to handle the notions about individualization which were inherent in the evaluation process.

Several conclusions might be drawn from the experience gained in attempts to gather data reflective of tendencies to individualize:

1. Criteria identified as indicative of individualization must be fully comprehended by checklist users before evaluation is attempted.

2. The way in which "individualization" is defined and assessed may interact with situational factors (e.g., number of students) and have more to do with indications of gain than the potency of the training program.

3. Lack of progress[13] on any checklist may be a function of lack of room for showing growth.

4. Scores indicative of individualization were constantly greater at the elementary level than the junior high level.

OBJECTIVE

6. Trainees will increase in their knowledge (p less than .01) about the characteristics of exceptional children, as measured by a pre and post-project multiple choice examination.

Cognitive measures of student outcomes have been the primary official tools for determining the success of educational programs. However, as the first five objectives have indicated, the primary thrust of this project has been toward the achievement of affective and performance types of objectives. Adequate assessment of cognitive outcomes on a group

---

[13] O'Connor, Edward F. Jr. Extending classical test theory to the measurement of change. Review of Educational Research. Winter. 1972. Vol. 42, #1. 73-98.

basis was difficult because different things were taught to different trainees and a uniform product was not desired. The outcomes achieved as reflected in Table XVIII are only a gross estimate of cognitive progress, but may be as adequate in sampling cognitive gains as any typical final exam because a deliberate attempt was not made to teach the answers to test items.

quent employment of 90% of the participants in occupations which utilize that training.

When this objective was written, the opportunity for employment, particularly for aides, was much greater than at the end of the project. Other attractions, particularly raising a family, or earning more as a sec-

TABLE XVIII

Special Education Knowledge Gained by Participants

	Mean Pretest Score	Mean Pretest Score	Mean Gain	(t) Level of Significance
All Trainees (N = 74)	29.4	32.6	3.2	3.96**
Aides (N = 31)	23.7	28.8	5.2	3.92**
Teachers (N = 43)	33.5	35.3	1.8	1.85**

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

From Table XVIII it may be seen that significant gains were made by both the teacher and aide groups. Gains were greater for the aide group than for the teacher group, but again the ceiling on the test may be a significant factor in precluding higher gains by the teacher group. From Table XVIII it may be concluded that objective 6 was attained.

OBJECTIVE

7. Trainees will value the training they receive through the EPDA project as measured by the subse-

retary or a waitress tended to make employment in education a function of personal choice. Now with the apparent over-supply of teachers and tight school district budgets, opportunities for employment are more limited. Because of this change, data gathered in regard to objective seven are less an indication of the extent to which "trainees value the training they received" than of the availability of the opportunities for employment. Data drawn in connection with this objective are useful in answering questions about the desir-

ability of expending resources in training various kinds of people who may not have an opportunity to use that training.

A questionnaire was mailed to all personnel who had received stipends for attending training at the project. Data derived from that questionnaire are presented in summary form in Table XIX.

training. This is particularly apparent in the group of aides hired locally by project staff where making that commitment was impossible.

Personal choice on the part of aides as to whether or not they would use training is also an important consideration in attaining a high rate of training utilization. Questionnaire data indicate three aides sent by districts elected not to use their training

TABLE XIX

Employment Rates and Training Utilization

Period during which training was received	Conditions	Teachers Sent by Districts	Aides Sent by Districts	Aides Hired Locally
1970-1972	Questionnaires sent	32	31	7
	Questionnaires returned	31(97%)	31(100%)	5(71%)
	Using Training	28(90%)	25(81%)	1(20%)
	Forced Unemployment	2(7%)	3(10%)	2(40%)

From Table XIX it may be seen that objective seven, which specified a ninety percent training utilization criterion level, was reached by the teacher group, but not by the aide group. The data also indicate that two teachers and three aides (sent by districts) respectively were not using their training because of the unavailability of positions in the area where they chose to reside. Although the number of trainees in the forced unemployment category is relatively small, it points out the importance of having commitments from school administrators to hire trainees on the completion of their

for family or other personal reasons. This same factor is apparent in the aide group hired locally where two (40%) indicated that they had elected not to use the training for personal reasons.

Objective seven was reached for the teacher group, but a combination of personal choice and unavailability of positions precluded reaching the specified criterion level in the aide group. One might conclude that selection and situational factors should be evaluated closely in setting objectives for training utilization, and that a ninety percent target may be too high.

APPENDIX C

The Training Model

The framework for the training program implemented during this three year grant period (July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1973) was initially tried under a separate one year EPDA grant during the 1969-1970 academic year. The major components of that project (practicum, staffing, and seminar) were retained with some evolutionary modifications which will be discussed in relation to each component in turn.

A model training week is portrayed in Figure I to provide a graphic orientation to the occurrence of and relationship between the three major components.

1. Practicum

From Figure I it may be seen that a majority of trainee time was devoted to practicum activity. During this time trainees worked as a member of a team in each of the eight laboratory school classrooms. Makeup of those teams varied through the three year grant period as follows:

1970-1971

Master Teacher
Experienced Teacher
Paraprofessional Aide
Permanent Aide

FIGURE I

Weekly Training Schedule

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8-9	////////	//////////	///////////	///////////	///////
9-10					
10-11					
11-12					
1-2	XXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXX
2-3	XXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX	///////////	XXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXX
3-4			///////////		

Practicum = [ ], Staffing = [//////], Seminar = [XXXX]

1971-1972

Master Teacher
Experienced Teacher[1]
Paraprofessional Aide[1]
Student Teachers (1-4)

1972-1973[2]

Master Teacher
Associate Teacher[1]
Junior Bloc Students (4-12)

Emphasis on personnel paid with project funds declined with each successive year. However, team size tended to enlarge because of involvement of university students. The relatively large number of adults in each classroom provided an opportunity for various trainees to work with individuals or small groups of children.

The USU Laboratory School was used as the primary site for the practicum (as well as staffing and seminar) activities. Eight classrooms in that "egg crate" type building serve the educational needs of over two hundred children in classes of kindergarten through the sixth grade. Approximately ten percent of these children have been formally classified as emotionally disturbed. Another ten percent come from foreign countries, and many do not speak English on entry to the school. The school also provides educational services for all of the hearing impaired children in the surrounding area. With the exception of some of the hearing impaired (deaf) children, all of the children mentioned above are fully integrated into the eight classrooms. The concept of "wide variability" was used to describe the characteristics of the children because it encompassed concern for the typical child as well as the more and less fortunate children on any one classification or combination of classifications. (E.g., intellectual capacity, emotional adjustment, and physical coordination.)[3]

The primary purpose of practicum activity was to lend realism to staffing and seminar activities. By working in the practicum an opportunity was available to:

1) observe children in school environments,
2) diagnose potentials and

---

[1]Paid with EPDA project funds.

[2]During this final year, a pilot program was initiated at the Logan Junior High School where one associate teacher worked with the regular teacher in each of six classrooms.

[3]The extent to which children with special problems were not identifiable by observers provided a dilemma in project operation. On one hand, it was the ultimate as an indication of project success. On the other, many participants and some visitors made comments such as, the children at Edith Bowen aren't like or are more easily controllable than those where I teach. (The implicate meaning in the latter statement was that what was being done at the laboratory school would not work elsewhere.)

problems,
3) prescribe what appeared to be appropriate curriculum,
4) implement that curriculum, and
5) follow up to evaluate the effectiveness of prescriptions.

These five functions are very much related to good "special education," and an attempt was made to provide all children in the classroom with a special or personalized education. In order to accomplish this it was necessary to coordinate and plan (staff) for individuals (children and adults).

2. Staffing

Self-contained special education classrooms are commonly organized so that one teacher can provide an individualized clinical type of program for each child. This is largely possible because one highly trained teacher works with a limited number of children in the special classroom. However, when more than twenty-five children with wide ranges of ability are accommodated in a regular classroom, the need increases for the teacher to work with auxiliary personnel to adequately diagnose educational potentials and to implement appropriate curriculum. Staffing is one method which the teacher can use to bring auxiliary personnel together. In staffing the records, perception, and skills of several different people are integrated in planning curriculum for children.

The primary focus of staffing is on individual children and their needs, not on specialties of adults (e.g., behavior modification, precision teaching, or task analysis) or curricular content (e.g., reading, math, or spelling). Although any of these could be a part of the prescribed curriculum if it were coincident with the needs of the child.

A "strategy sheet"[4] was developed and used as a format for staffing, and to provide a record of what was proposed, implemented, and evaluated as method(s) for meeting the needs of various children. School was dismissed early on Wednesday afternoons to permit more extensive in-depth staffing of children. This provided an opportunity for team members to more fully share their perceptions and records about children, and to coordinate the implementation of appropriate strategies.

During the 1970-1971 year of the project, University staff and other consultants were invited on a regular basis to share their specialized knowledge during the staffing sessions. However, as the project progressed, master teachers became more confident in their own judgments and more proficient at using the contributions of the less sophisticated trainees, and as a result specialists were used less.

Traditionally, teachers have been taught to be self-sufficient in the classroom. This practice has militated against the effective use of paraprofessional aides

[4]Directors annual progress report for "A program to assist educational personnel to teach students of wide variability in regular classrooms." 1971-1972, Utah State University, pp. 58-60. (ERIC designation =ED 068 443).

and even sophisticated consultants. By becoming proficient in the staffing process, teachers can develop better clinical types of programs for children, and most importantly they can enlist the assistance of others in planning and implementing personalized curricula for more of the special children who are now in regular classrooms.

3. Seminar (see Appendix I for topics)

Each trainee participated in approximately 144 hours of seminar activity during their project involvement. During this time attempts were made to expose the participants to the people and ideas which might assist them most in their work of educating all children. (See Appendix H for topics during this final year.) Most of the professors from the Department of Special Education had at least one two-hour block of time with the trainees. During these sessions a maximum of interaction between trainees and presentors was encouraged. Several sessions were devoted to sharing ideas and perceptions which the trainees had drawn from activities in their practicum classroom, and/or their pre-project experience.

One of the most essential aspects of seminar activity was the involvement of trainees in the minority emphasis weeks on campus for American Indians, Blacks, and Chicanos. These sessions were particularly productive when trainees representative of those minorities accepted the leadership for the group.

After involvement in practicum, staffing, and seminars at the Laboratory School, continued contact was kept with trainees. This was done by way of on-site visits where trainees were employed and/or in workshops for which trainees returned to the laboratory school. Continued contact was important for providing consultive services to trainees as they confronted various situations in naturalistic settings, and it provided feedback as to the usefulness of various aspects of training.

APPENDIX D

The Exceptional Child - Is He Better Off Integrated into the Regular Classroom or Segregated ?

The question noted above is frequently asked of people associated with the many new programs and the current national trend directed at meeting the needs of exceptional children in regular classrooms. The question is phrased in a stereotyped fashion that is symptomatic of a society which is looking for simple answers to complex questions. The simple answer can only be phrased in a form which initially appears as evasive, i.e., "It depends ...." However, the delineation of the variables on which the effectiveness of integrated programs depends can then direct us to appropriate answers for implementation and/or improvement of appropriate educational programs.

A first category of variables can be associated with the child and his idiosyncratic nature. Generally speaking, the more extreme the exceptionality, the more questionable the use of the integrated classroom would be. Yet, anyone familiar with children realizes that exceptionalities are never uniformally debilitating. The child is always more proficient in certain modalities than others; e.g., a child may have a hearing deficit, but his proficiency in sight, taste, or touch may vary to at least partially compensate for any one deficiency, or a child may be academically retarded but hold above average potential in social and/or creative ways. Assessment of the child's profile of strengths or weaknesses and their interaction is necessary before a recommendation should be made.

A second category of variables can be associated with the nature of the teacher with whom the child would work. The extent to which teacher differences have served to confound researchers and their findings in attempts to demonstrate the relative superiority of various methodologies for instruction is notorious. Yet, the question of the appropriateness of segregated vs. integrated placement is often asked without consideration of this variable. The fact is that some teachers have difficulty working in a classroom of more typical children. The number and types of children which any teacher can handle in a particular classroom is largely a function of his/her attitudes and competencies.

A third category of variables is the resources that can be drawn upon. Resources can be either material or human. Material resources are commonly thought of as things for the child or teacher to work with. Human resources may be in the form of other children, aides, volunteers, co-workers, and/or specialists called upon for expertise. Of course, the physical availability of these resources (human or material) is only one consideration in whether or not they can be drawn upon. They can be physically present but useless (or worse than useless when they take up space that could otherwise be used, or when they threaten the teacher) if the teacher cannot efficiently locate and work with them.

Thus, when the question is asked about whether integration or segregation is best, variables relating to at least three major categories should be considered (the nature of the child, teacher, and resources). Also, recognition must be given to the fact that interaction occurs within and between these three categories of variables. Only by intensive evaluation of these variables and their interaction can an appropriate answer for any one child be made, and that answer must be reviewed frequently because a change in any one variable can destroy the foundation for a previous decision.

Several investigators[1,2, & 3] have made noteworthy contributions to the ongoing attempt to define what characteristics contribute most to an optimum learning environment. Hopefully that quest can be continued and extended by a type of multi-variate analysis that can take into account the myriad of variables that come into play in any one teaching/learning event.

But, until these variables and their interactive effects can be predicted and monitored more closely than is currently possible, a categorical answer to the questions raised above is inappropriate.

---

[1]Esposita, Dominick. Homogeneous and heterogeneous ability grouping: principle findings and implications for evaluating and designing more effective educational environments. Review of Educational Research. Vol. 43, No. 2, Spring, 1973. pp. 163-179.

[2]Rosenshire, Barak, and Furst, Norma. Research on teacher performance criteria. In Research in Teacher Education: A Symposium. Edited by B. O. Smith, Prentice-Hall. 1971. pp. 37-71.

[3]Vaac, Nicholas A. Long term effects of special class intervention for emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children. September, 1972. pp. 15-22.

APPENDIX E

Names and Addresses of Associate Teachers
1972-1973

Name	Permanent Forwarding Address
(Edith Bowen)	
Anderson, Sally[3]	47 S. 2nd W., Logan, Utah 84321
Bonta, Darlene[3]	224 E. 4th N. Logan, Utah 84321
Burke, Joan T.[1]	413 E. 3rd N., Logan, Utah 84321
Carraway, Mary	147 W. 4th S., Logan, Utah 84321
Cuncic, Diana	1005 N. 7th E., Logan, Utah 84321
Lee, Norene	Sagamore Farm, Paradise, Utah
Leishman, Kathryn[1]	109 N. Center, Wellsville, Utah
Palmer, Sylvia	62 E. 3rd N., Logan, Utah 84321
Taylor, Betty	1653 E. 1400 N., Logan, Utah 84321
Valcarce, Susan	720 N. 1st E., Logan, Utah 84321
(Junior High)	
Allen, Kathleen	658 E. 6th N., Logan, Utah 84321
Fox, Allen	1073 N. 4th E., Logan, Utah 84321
Godfrey, Sheri[2]	439 S. Main, Logan, Utah 84321
Muller, Deborah[3]	180 N. 2nd W., Logan, Utah 84321
Slagle, Sandra	680 E. 14th N. #2, Logan, Utah 84321
Taylor, Barbara	830 E. 275 N. #3, Logan, Utah 84321
Tucker, Jannett	Box 186, Murtaugh, Idaho

[1]Accepted full time teaching position and did not stay with the project for a full year of training.

[2]Dropped out of project because of pregnancy.

[3]Replacements for participants who left the project before the end of the training period.

APPENDIX F

Names and Roles of Staff and Consultants
1972-1973

1. EPDA Project Staff

Jean Pugmire	Project Director
Bruce Arneklev	Research Coordinator
Arthur Jackson	Director of Budget and Coordinator of Practicum
Elwin Nielsen	Psychology Liason
Muriel Robert	Elementary Education Liason
Phyllis Publicover	Special Education Liason
Orson Tew	Secondary Education Liason
Andrea Larsen	Secretary
Christine Muller-Schwarze	Play Therapy
Carolyn Barcus	Grad. Assist. from Psychology
Shannon Madsen	Grad. Assist. from Inst. Media
Sally Welborn	Grad. Assist. from Inst. Media

2. Edith Bowen Laboratory School Staff

Arthur Jackson	Principal
Dale Harding	Assistant Principal
Joan Bowden	Primary Unit I Teacher
Ron Tolman	Primary Unit I Teacher
Marjorie Rappleye	Primary Unit II Teacher
Ilone Long	Primary Unit II Teacher
Ivan Pedersen	Primary Unit III Teacher
Barbara Ann Howell	Primary Unit III Teacher
Helen Tanner	Primary Unit IV Teacher
Eyre Turner	Primary Unit IV Teacher
Robert Hanson	Hard-of-Hearing Class Teacher
Patricia Gailey	Hard-of-Hearing Class Teacher
Ruth Rice	Moore Library & Media Center Dir.
Elaine Johnson	Secretary
Denzil Harris	Custodian

3. Logan Junior High Staff

a. Regular Teaching Staff

Bruce Albertsen	Math Teacher
M. T. Butterfield	English Teacher
Jana Dahle	English Teacher
Shardon Morrill	Math Teacher
Clair Robinson	Social Studies Teacher
Rendall Seamons	Social Studies Teacher

b. Administrative and supporting staff

Eldrid Larsen	Pupil Personnel Director
Sherman Hansen	Principal
Lee Colston	Asistant Principal
Judy Ivarie	Remedial Reading Teacher
Helen Morris	Counselor

4. Resource Consultants from Department of Communicative Disorders

Jay Jensen	Department Head
Jackie Littledyke	Consultant
Fred Berg	Consultant
Student Assistants	Screening and Instruction

5. Resource Consultants from the Department of Elementary Education

Ronald Petrie	Department Head
Bryce Adkins	Consultant
Malcom Allred	Consultant
Mary E. Carigan	Consultant
Gail Johnson	Consultant
Jay Monson	Consultant
Morris Mower	Consultant
Evelyn Wiggins	Consultant
Tom Taylor	Consultant
Ferrel Kump	Graduate Assistant
Joe Flemming	Graduate Assistant
Larry Klein	Graduate Assistant

6. Resource Consultants from the Department of Psychology

Michael Bertoch	Department Head
Lorene Allen	Parent Group Leader

7. Resource Consultants from the Department of Secondary Education

Kenneth Farrer	Department Head
John Nichols	Graduate Assistant
Rhonda Rudd	Graduate Assistant
Mary Carter	Graduate Assistant
Sue McArthur	Graduate Assistant

8. Resource Consultants from the Department of Special Education

Marvin Fifield	Department Head
Lionel Brady	Consultant
Jim Butler	Upward Bound
Abbie Megill	Upward Bound
Julia Collins	Utah School for the Blind
Alan Hofmeister	Consultant
Sara James	Consultant
Dwayne Peterson	Consultant
Devoe Rickert	Consultant
Joan Thorkildsen	Consultant
Amy Budge	Graduate Assistant
Lee McKenzie	Graduate Assistant
Charles Blackwell	Graduate Assistant

9. Other Utah State University Staff Resources

Oral Ballam	Dean, College of Education
Walter Borg	Project Director, Utah Protocal Materials
Lois Downs	Health, Phy. Ed., & Recreation
Dorothy Lewis	Child Development & Family Life
Leo Martinez	Ed. Administration
James P. Shaver	Bureau of Ed. Research
Ross Pedersen	History
Duane Hedin	Instructional Media
Mike Jones	Health, Phy. Ed., & Recreation

10. Superintendents

Bryce Draper	Cache County
James C. Blair	Logan City
Wm. L. Garner (contact - Byron Moore)	Ogden City
Clark N. Johnson (contact - Keith Steck)	Tooele County
William Medor	Grand County

11. Other Participants

Gaylen Ashcroft	Parent Group Leader
Richard Ulibarri	Weber State Consultant from Depart. of Ethnic Studies
Darnel Haney	Depart. of Ethnic Studies (Weber)
Joanne Gillis	Consultant from State IMC Center
Vickey Harris	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Don Harris	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Robert Hobson	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Regina Tsosic	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Ronald Tso	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Ernest Quiroga	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Irving Toddy	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Eric LaRose	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Zetta Satterwaite	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
Jim Jefferson	Minority Group Seminar Consultant
John Ulibarri	Director of Ethnic Study for Ogden City Schools

12. Other Consultants

Alice Chase	Former Teacher of Edith Bowen Lab Sci.
Henry Bertness	Tacoma Public Schools
Adrienne Kennedy	Gestalt Education - Palo Alto, Cal.
Carolyn Neff Green	Jordan School District
Vincent Rogers	U. of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.

APPENDIX G

Junior Bloc Students
1972-1973

FALL QUARTER

Allred, Mary Ann
Anderson, Cheri Donna
Ashcroft, Elaine
Badertscher, Bobette
Belnap, Peggy
Conrad, Joanne
Crandall, Marsha Joan
Downs, Brent Robert
Findlay, Janice L.
Firth, Verna LeAnn
Fukui, Jeanette
Gardner, Mary Jane
Goddard, Lynn
Hardinger, Kathy L.
Jackson, Nancy
Jacobsen, Janet
Jenkins, Janice
Jenkins, Kathy
Jensen, Catherine Mae
Jensen, Sue
John, Norine Hopkins
Johnson, Sheri Ann
Larsen, Nancy Lee
Mabey, Nancy
Olsen, Sharon Marie
Poloni, Leann
Porter, Nancy Kay
Redding, Carol Ann
Riches, Gayle
Rumbold, Virginia M.
Schmidt, Peggy Sue
Sibley, Daniel Todd
Smith, Debra Ann
Taylor, Christine
Weisgerber, Donald

WINTER QUARTER

Adamson, Steven
Anderberg, Shanon
Anderson, Michael
Anderson, Rtuh
Anderson, Peggy
Carver, Kathy
Chapple, Glenn
Epperson, Elizabeth
Findlay, Blair
Haycock, Johnny
Hopkins, Margaret
Jenkins, Juanita
Jones, DeeAnn
Jones, DonnaLee
Knutson, Susan
Krebs, Ilene
Larsen, Georgia
Lipscomb, James
Newman, Julie
Nicholson, George
Shinkle, Linda
Skadal, Deborah
Slater, Kathy
Sly, Denise
Smiley, Bridget
Spackman, Marjene
Stokes, Linda
Walker, Pamlea
Wilkerson, Ruby
Winters, Kathleen
Wycherly, Kathy

SPRING QUARTER

Anderson, Janet
Augustine, Peggy Spence
Bate, Shauna
Bilek, Robert Carl
Bingham, Rachel
Braegger, Brenda
Burt, Julien
Carlsruh, Abby Jane
Child, Kathleen Alice
Christensen, D-Ann
Douglass, Karren
Elzey, Sharon
Erni, Christine
Gibbons, Ann Drue
Gibbons, Ladawn
Grange, Marsha Lee
Groutage, Farol Ann
Haywood, Ruth
Hill, Janet Ruth
Horsley, Janet
Jensen, Loraine
Jensen, Regena
Johnson, Kay Ann
Johnson, Norma Rose
Lemon, Velaine
Margetts, Marianne
McCracken, Timothy
Milliner, Roberta
Moore, Sharmeen
Mortensen, Teri
Page, Rose Marie
Porter, Judy
Richens, Mary
Romletter, Lisa
Scholes, Barbara Ann
Smith, George Robert
Swendsen, Calvin

FALL QUARTER

WINTER QUARTER

SPRING QUARTER

Tew, Linda Lee
Tousley, Rick
Triscik, Jane
Uresk, Barbara
Watts, Dorothy Lynn
Welling, Debra
Yonk, Becky

APPENDIX H

Seminar Topics

Anecdotal Records
Non-Verbal Communication
Case Studies
Carl Rogers
Life Space Interviewing
Individualized Instruction
by Jean Pugmire

Children with Handicaps
Gifted Children
Fields of Psychology
Questioning and Life Space Interviewing
Birth Defects
by Phyllis Publicover, Spec. Edu.

EPDA Objectives
Arthur Combs
Evaluation
Self-Concept
by Bruce Arneklev

Non-Verbal Communication
Richard Foster
Sharing of Ideas & Things that "Work"
by Muriel Robert

Navajo Philosophy
Indian Education
Ethna Reid Reading Technique
by Sally Anderson, Associate Teacher

Discovering Method in Science
Open Classroom
by Betty Taylor, Associate Teacher

Epilepsy
by Mike Jones

Play Therapy
by Christine Muller-Schwarze

Role of Special Education
by Hank Bertness

Visual Literacy
by Ruth Rice, Media Center Spec.

Distar
by Carol Beasley

Parent Groups
by Elwin Nielsen, Psychology

Personalized Math
by Al Hoffmeister

Gestalt Education
by Carolyn Barcus

Listening
by Orson Tew

Music
by Helen Tanner

Legal Aspects of Education
by Larry Kline

How It Feels to be Black
by Zetta Satterwaite

Indian History
by Jim Jefferson

Chicano History
by Henry Dalton

Curriculum Materials
by Joanne Gillis

I'm OK - You're OK
by Darlene Bonta

French Course Teaching
by Diana Cuncic

Ceramics
by Norene Lee

Informal Reading Inventories
by Sylvia Palmer

Reading Evaluation Materials
by Mary Carraway

First Aid
by Art Mendini

Birth Defects
by Duane Pederson

APPENDIX I

Instructional Materials

Person to Contact at USU for further information	"Title" and Content
Bowden, Joan	"Personalized Instruction - A Way of Life" (Direction to classroom teachers on how to organize adults and children in an open type classroom in order to meet their needs and maintain records for planning and accountability.)
Hanson, Robert	*"What Classroom Teachers can do for Hearing Impaired Children" (Provides experiences for participants to increase their empathy for children with hearing impariments, as well as suggestions on classroom procedures to improve learning environments for all children.)
Howell, Barbara	*"Promoting Creative Expression among all Children through Poetry" (A unit for instruction to teachers on the use of poetry to increase creative expression from children with wide ranges of ability.)
Pedersen, Ivan	"An Experimental Method of Social Studies Instruction" (An economics approach, using photography and miniature construction, as medium to involve pupils for the study of the people of Utah.)
Rappleye, Marjorie	"Activating Interest Centers in a Classroom with Children" (Indicates steps to be taken by teachers in providing personalized instruction from the beginning of a school year.)

*Self-contained slide tape presentations, each of which is about forty-five minutes in length; however, longer study would be in order for a teacher who wishes to implement strategies suggested.

Person to Contact at USU for further information	"Title" and Content
Rice, Ruth	"Do You See What I See" (Visual Literacy - The perception of danger, tranquility or excitement through individual exposure to illustration stimuli in both still and motion form.)
Robbert, Muriel & Thorkildsen, Joan	"Kaleidoscope of a Child" (The multi-faceted view of a child seen by various personnel within the school setting that could be of help in better understanding and planning for that specific person in the staffing process.)
Tanner, Helen	"Childrens' Feelings about Self and how they Affect Behavior" (Activities which teachers can use in classrooms to clarify preceptions which children have of themselves and others.)
Turner, Eyre	"An Affective Approach to Open Education through Pupil Responsibility and Independence" (Suggestions to teachers for promoting independence and responsibility among elementary age school children with discussion of methods for implementation.)

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY · LOGAN, UTAH 84322

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION

APPENDIX J

June 20, 1973

Dr. Jean Pugmire, Director
Education Profession Development Act Project
Campus

Dear Dr. Pugmire:

After long consideration and considerable rewriting, I am forwarding to you this brief summary of my views of the EPDA Project after almost 5 years of involvement with its progress. This summary is divided into 4 sections, covering items which are within my responsibility as a representative of the Department of Special Education who has been assigned as proposal writer, team member, and part-time project staff member.

1. Accomplishment or original objectives.
Two of the original objectives have special relevance to special education. The project clearly demonstrated that children with most mild exceptionalities could progress well in the kind of open classroom which eventually emerged at the Laboratory School. Children with severe emotional disturbances were given excellent support services and in several instances made excellent social and academic progress. The one severe exceptionality which was well served in the project was severe hearing loss which was the only exceptionality that retained a special class emphasis with a fully trained teacher. The project, overall, demonstrated the need for a hierarchy and a variety of services for exceptional children and their families. The Laboratory School became one source of high level services but did not demonstrate the probability that most exceptional children can be served in regular classes without intensive, very specialized support.

Another original objective had to do with increased language skill on the part of children. There is clear evidence that the children were provided with enriched and enriching language learning experiences. A fantastic variety of language arts activities emerged with superb results for exceptional children known to me personally. My own dissertation (in progress) is expected to provide concrete evidence of gains in verbal sensitivity of teachers matched with gains in verbal skills of pupils. Interaction of staff in the project, it seems to me, has been coupled with gains by pupils.

2. Accomplishment of objectives at Logan Junior High School. When the project was extended in its fourth and final year to Logan Junior High School, the staff was at a high level of enthusiasm and expertise. Very humanly we minimized

the importance of time in effecting change. In my opinion, we let ourselves in for a frustrating experience which improved the lives of only a very very few pupils (whom I can enumerate). The special university staff assigned to LJHS worked well together. Their staff meetings were for me a personal growth experience. Project meetings at LJHS, on the other hand, were frustrating and seemed to result in few changes to help exceptional children. I can document little which would stand as definite, positive, provable change for the better which can be predicted to carry over next year. The process of how to meet the needs of pupils of wide variability was not generalized, although several individual exceptional pupils were helped.

In order to have a recognizable effect, the project should have been housed visibly at the LJHS, have had its staff fully assigned to the public school facility, have participated in their activities, have set up models for long-range programs, and have had at least a 3-year funding base. Selected administrators, representative teachers, and parents should have become part-time project staff and from the beginning only those teachers who volunteered should have been chosen to participate. Limiting the work to grade 7 was probably an error. Teacher associates should probably have remained as project staff, assigned out to specific classrooms to implement specific projects. The Summer Workshop (as was previously demonstrated at the Laboratory School) took place before the impact of project objectives was internalized by participants.

Some teachers and pupils operated more successfully because of project impact. I personally felt most useful fall quarter when I was assigned to work in specific rooms. I also felt a drop in effectiveness after project plans for 1973-74 were dropped. I thoroughly enjoyed the instructional seminars with teacher associates but both associates and I would have benefited from application and follow-up on the ideas presented through seminars and workshops

3. Influence on the Department of Special Education.

Department personnel were rather heavily involved with the project during its first year. Because of professional differences of opinion, the Department did not adopt many positive attitudes during that year. It is rather unfortunate that deep involvement did not continue after you took over as director. We would have gained if we had stayed with it when project emphasis changed. Department personnel remained as expert consultants, of course, but consultants rarely change their own behavior. I believe that changes in Special Education as a result of the EPDA project have been minimal. Only a few of us seem to realize what the project offered in terms of demonstration, practica, and expert assistance to Special Education courses. Individual students from this Department have conducted numerous individual projects but we have not incorporated results on a wide basis. Most of us have been aware that the "project next door" exists but probably not aware how it exemplified new trends in educating exceptional children.

The Department gained greatly in tangible ways from the project. New staff were located, employed wholly or in part by the project, and remained as members of our faculty. EPDA consultants met with our staff and students. Materials were exchanged and loaned. Play therapy equipment was placed in the Exceptional Child Center. Most important was the extension of practica facilities. Likewise, the Department shared consultants and materials with the project. In this respect, a very health basis for long-term cooperation developed.

4. Influence on the area program in training personnel for disturbed and maladjusted children and youth.

I will be forever indebted to EPDA for making it possible to bridge the gap between "elementary" and special. The training program here has been able to stay on top of trends recommended nationally because of the existence of EPDA. You, Dr. Arneklev, Dr. Jackson, and Ms. Bowden have provided consultation, counseling, demonstrations, and general leadership whenever asked. I think the most useful experiences were for those fellowship students as team members for a full quarter at Edith Bowen. Working with a team, including aides, on on-going behavioral problems was mentioned as very valuable by our students. They have reiterated that the opportunity to attend selected seminars, to meet nationally-known consultants, and to be exposed to the "wide variability" concept has enriched their training program.

Lionel Brady and I have made several changes in the ED/SM training program as a result of both of us representing Special Education on the EPDA staff. We include instruction and exposure to the "wide variability" concept in our courses, we provide experience with aides in the practica, and we utilize directly EPDA materials.

In conclusion, my evaluation is that the EPDA project at the Laboratory School changed the professional orientation of those Special Education faculty and students who became directly involved with specific Edith Bowen faculty and pupils. It was seen as an action research project by many in our Department and certainly a few desired more opportunity for direct research in Special Education. In no way can project personnel be faulted on attempts to communicate, share, or facilitate professional activity. Time, personalities, and other priorities interfered with fuller joint participation.

It would be my personal recommendation that future projects refrain from a shift in emphasis (objectives) midway. This last year, I believe, might have been better spent in careful evaluation of attainment of original objectives. Much information on exceptional children in regular classrooms remains in limbo because of the new emphasis on packet productions. While the latter is very enriching and satisfying to those of us close to the project, it represented a diversion from other important emphases.

The concluding workshop (Elementary Education 656: Personalizing Instruction) which I attended showed that when both are at their best it is difficult to see practices as exclusively the province of Elementary or Special Education. It was a superb professional learning experience.

Please feel free to ask me to revise or expand on points listed above.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

Very truly yours,

Phyllis R. Publicover

Phyllis R. Publicover

cc:
Kline
Arneklev

LOGAN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
TELEPHONE 752-4755
875 NORTH 2ND EAST
LOGAN, UTAH 84321
SHERMAN HANSEN, PRINCIPAL
C. LEE COLSTON, VICE PRINCIPAL

JAMES C. BLAIR, SUPERINTENDENT

June 26, 1973

Dr. Jean Pugmire
Director of EPDA Project
In Special Education
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Dear Dr. Pugmire,

May I take this opportunity to thank you and the other members of the USU Staff that worked with us during the 1972-73 school year on the EPDA project which was "To Assist Educational Personnel to Teach Students of Wide Variability in the Regular Class".

I feel that we did make good progress toward accomplishing the goals we established, and that the teachers involved in the project, although not all to the same degree, did become better able to recognize and work with the individual needs of the students in the classroom through self development in the following areas: An increased feeling of competency, an ability to help students work toward their own goals, being able to provide only as much structure as students need, an acceptance of the responsibility to continually help to channel his learning into constructive areas, an increased flexibility, sensitiveness and awareness, better intra-departmental planning, working cooperatively with other personnel, an ability to develop appropriate materials and to appropriately use already available materials, by adopting a more acceptant attitude toward student differences, having better communication between personnel, and developing a sense of honest communication with students.

I expect the work we did this year to have a great influence in the future on the type of classroom instruction that is given, not only by the teachers that were involved in the project but by the influence they have had, and will have, on the other members of the staff.

Already, this summer, two teachers that were involved in the project have spent a full week working on plans and arranging materials for use in

helping to individualize their classroom program when school begins next fall.

We are planning to continue working on developing more fully an individualized student centered program at the Logan Junior High School.

My sincere thanks for the help you and the other members of the EPDA staff have given us.

Sincerely yours,

Sherman Hansen

Sherman Hansen
Principal

SH:frm